

From: "Jim Thomas" [REDACTED]
To: <sonya.davis@mrc.virginia.gov>
Date: 2/9/07 7:32PM
Subject: RFAB comments

I would like to offer my input regarding the proposed RFAB projects. Of the multi-year projects only two serve to directly enhance fishing habitat and/or population. Of the newly proposed items not a single one meets that criteria. Yet, this was the criteria that was lifted up to anglers as the benefit of instituting the licenses to begin with.

Rather than creating new habitat what we see is an abundance of funds being used to enhance town and city budgets, state organizations that were previously funded by the legislature (VIMS & VMRC), doctoral projects, and anglers' club pet projects. Everyone seems to see this big pot of money that is there for the taking.

I would like to comment on the proposals as I have seen them:

A) 2007 Sunshine Children's Fishing Program. Denny Dobbins, Portsmouth Anglers Club. \$7,194.

I used to be a member of the Portsmouth Anglers Club. This is a great project but I do not believe that it meets the criteria stipulated for RFAB funds. The P.A.C. funded this project on its own for years and I believe that they should continue to do so. Please ask questions regarding how much education actually takes place. I believe that items (B and C are the same)

B) 2006 Saxis & Morley's Wharf Fishing Pier Youth Fishing Tournaments (Year 6). Allen Evans, Eastern Shore of Virginia Anglers Club. \$2,500.

C) 2007 Early Summer Children's Fishing Program. Melvin Dudley, Northampton County Anglers Club. \$1,100.

D) Artificial Reef, Funding for Deployment of Structure 2006-2007. Mike Meier, VMRC. \$150,000.

I favor this proposal.

E) Visual Function in Chesapeake Bay Sport and Prey Fishes: Summer Flounder, Bluefish, Cobia, and Atlantic Menhaden (Year 2). A. Horodysky, R. Brill, R. Latour, VIMS. \$50,289.

Helping people catch and harvest fish does not assist stock or abundance or habitat. I am against this. I am also opposed because Atlantic Menhaden has been added to the mix. It is pretty obvious what is really going on here.

F) Estimating Relative Abundance of Young-of-Year American Eel, *Anguilla rostrata*, in the Virginia Tributaries of Chesapeake Bay (Year 7). Marcel Montane, VIMS. \$36,325.

I do not see where this is a recreational issue and would challenge the study to show where in six years it has made significant progress for

recreational fisheries.

G) Enhancing Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV) Habitat: Research and Education for Restoration (Year 13). Robert Orth, VIMS. \$95,689.

I favor this proposal.

H) Estimating Relative Juvenile Abundance of Recreationally Important Finfish and Crustaceans in the Virginia Portion of Chesapeake Bay. M. Fabrizio, M. Montane, VIMS. \$469,568.

I am opposed to this without additional detail concerning species of finfish and crustaceans. It seems to me that the recreational harvest of crustaceans is minor and this is really a commercial study disguised as a recreational one.

V. New Projects.

I) Virginia Marine Sportfish Collection (Year 1). J. Grist, R. Owens, VMRC. \$12,000.

I am against this proposal. I see no way that this can be counted in the established criteria.

J) SAS Licensing and Training for VMRC Technical Staff. Joe Grist, VMRC. \$38,500.

I am against this proposal. I see no way that this can be counted in the established criteria.

K) Quinby Harbor Enhancements. David Fluhart, Quinby Harbor Committee, Accomack County. \$352,950.

I am against this proposal. This is a local project that should be funded by the locality through taxes collected on the adjacent property and boats. Certainly, people on the western shore should not be expected to pay for this.

L) Saxis Fishing Pier Expansion. Charles Tull, Mayor, Town of Saxis. \$132,107.

I am neither for or against this proposal.

M) 2007 Hope House Fishing Excursion and Clinic. D. Hurst, C. Macin, Great Bridge Fisherman's Association. \$2,500.

I am against this proposal for the same reason as A, B, and C, above.

N) Abundance, Distribution and Biology of Sharks and Rays in Chesapeake Bay and Virginia's Coastal Lagoons: Continuation of a Long-term Monitoring and Research Program. D. Grubbs, J. Musick, VIMS. \$89,073.

The recreational value of sharks and rays is minor. Most recreational anglers find these to be nuisance fish. Those that do fish for them do not

do it in lagoons. This is a study which is designed for commercial interest; my guess is oysters. This should be turned down outright!!!!

O) Response of Summer Flounder to Hypoxia in Chesapeake Bay: Physiological Tolerances and Shifts in Habitat Use. M. Fabrizio, R. Brill, VIMS. \$99,721.

I am neither for or against this proposal as I do not understand the recreational benefit of the study.

P) Effects of Piscivorous Fishes on Local Juvenile Game Fish Populations. P. McGrath, J. Musick, VIMS. \$45,530.

I am neither for or against this proposal however I do understand the recreational benefit of the study.

Q) Laboratory Investigations of the Ability of Striped Bass to Function under Low Ambient Oxygen Conditions. R. Brill, D. Gauthier, VIMS. \$81,468.

I am neither for or against this proposal however I do understand the recreational benefit of the study.

R) Estimate and Assess Social and Economic Importance and Value of Menhaden to Chesapeake Bay Stakeholders and Region (3 Year Study). James Kirkley, VIMS. \$1,127,235.

I am 100% opposed to this study. Menhaden is not a recreational fish.

Rev. James D. Thomas
21 Lodge Road
Poquoson, VA. 23662



Saltwater fishing license holder